

The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JANUARY 21, 1904.

NO. 3.

DISCORD AMONG ITALIAN CATHOLICS.



WHILST the German and Swiss "Katholikentage" manifested the greatest unity and harmony among the Catholics of those two countries, the Catholic Congress held at Bologna on Nov. 10th, 1903, resulted in a very serious split among the Catholics of Italy.

In January, 1902, the Holy See had laid down a rule according to which all groups and associations of Catholics in Italy were to affiliate with one or the other of the sections of the Congress which answered their particular object.

Thus, the associations of the "Christian Democrats" also saw themselves obliged to join section II. of the Congress if they wished to be recognized as Catholic associations. So far they had acted independently under the leadership of the Abbate Romolo Murri. At Milan, the *Osservatore Cattolico*, a moderate Christian Democratic paper, had powerfully helped to spread Catholic associations called "fasci democratici." Were all these associations to place themselves under the leadership of the veterans of the Catholic social movement, such as Count Paganuzzi, Msgr. Cerutti, etc? Whilst the "fasci democratici" did not hesitate to join the second section of the Congress, the followers of the Abbate Murri submitted some observations to the Holy See. The Abbate himself incurred public censure for a speech at San Marino on "Liberty and Christianity." After that, he urged his followers to join the "work of the Congress," but himself withdrew apparently from all activity in the social field.

To make it easier for the Christian Democrats to join, Count Paganuzzi resigned the presidency of the Congress, for, although claiming to be himself a Christian Democrat, so far as that word implied "popular Catholic activity," he was the bugbear of the

"advanced Christian Democrats." The Abbate Murri rejoiced so loudly over his removal at the time that he received a sharp reprimand from Cardinal Sarto, now Pope Pius X. In place of Paganuzzi, of Venice, Count Grosoli, of Ferrara, was made president of the work of the Congress and confirmed by Pius X. Count Grosoli belongs to the moderate wing of the Christian Democrats. As the new rules were to be applied for the first time, the meeting of the Congress was postponed until Nov. 10th. Meanwhile a small Catholic paper at Orvieto received a public rebuke from the Pro-Secretary of State, Msgr. Merry del Val, for voicing too loudly the thoughts of the "advanced Christian Democrats."

Seeing that his secessionist attitude, which had been blamed by Leo XIII., would not be tolerated by Pius X., the Abbé Murri resolved to go to Bologna, but as master of the situation. And he succeeded.

Bologna is the centre of the "advanced Christian Democracy"; and, strange to say, the Italian government made a reduction in railroad fares to the participants in the Congress. Thanks to this reduction, the Congress at Bologna had a larger attendance than any of its predecessors (2,000) and, in particular, the followers of the Abbate Murri were numerous. The evening before, Murri held a meeting of his own, to which only "advanced Christian Democrats" were admitted (more than 500). There the order was given to submit quietly to the program of Count Grosoli, but to vote solidly on every measure. This program was literally carried out and made the Abbate Murri "the uncrowned king of the Congress." Before the beginning of the first session, the 500 "Murrists" had carefully chosen their seats, by groups, each under a leader who received his instructions from the Abbate himself.

With the exception of the party organs, all others are unanimous in stating that only Socialistic meetings can give an idea of the hissing, howling, stamping of feet, etc., that took place in this exclusively Catholic assembly.

The *Osservatore Cattolico*, of Milan, and some other papers of the same tendency, tried to palliate the scandal, but their explanations only confirmed the facts as related by the others. Men worthy of all respect, such as Count Paganuzzi, the famous Father Zocchi, Msgr. Cerutti, Msgr. Scotton, were cried down without interference from the chair. *La Voce della Verità* of Nov. 17th had two columns in small print, enumerating the irregularities and insults that occurred during the sessions, and which were silently tolerated by the chair.

For the first time, only five out of the 300 Italian bishops participated, and even these five appeared only at a few sessions.

For the first time, no collection was taken up for the Holy Father, no address to the Pope submitted to the members, no protest issued against the spoliation of the Holy See by the Italian government. Instead, thanks were publicly voted to the civil authorities for their protection of the Congress.

Since the adjournment of the Congress, the discord seems to have grown worse. Of the sixty members of the Permanent Committee of the Congress, only thirty signed the resolutions there adopted; the rest, according to the *Unità Cattolica* of Florence, abstaining by way of protest.

The *Unità Cattolica*, which represents the "intransigents" of the Catholic party, declares that it does not accept the resolutions of the Congress, and that, as far as itself is concerned, the work of the Congress has ceased to exist. The same was said by the *Riscossa* and the *Difesa* of Venice.

The *Osservatore Cattolico*, of Milan, the *Avvenire d'Italia*, and the *Cittadino*, of Genoa, are trying to reduce the whole matter to a question between "the old" and "the young," but they do not deny what the *Unità Cattolica* says about the differences of principle which divide Catholic Italy into two hostile camps: "We are divided," says the *Unità*, 1°. on the manner of judging the Italian revolution and its consequences of right and fact. That is no question of tendencies, but of principle, of justice and right; 2°. We are divided in our understanding of liberty and the use it can be put to in public. That also is a question of principle, not of tendencies; 3°. We are divided on the fundamental idea of Catholic activity, which some claim to be essentially religious and social; others, social and political. Hence on the one hand, entire submission to the bishops and clergy; on the other, independence from 'the swaddling clothes,' and complete separation from the sacristy. If these are no principles at stake, what are they?"

The expression "swaddling clothes" is an allusion to the statement of the Abbate Murri, made at the beginning of the sessions, that it was time to get rid of them, although they had served a purpose in the beginning of the congresses.

In the above we have followed Rev. Dr. Maignen (No. 3746 of the *Vérité Française*). The Cologne *Volkszeitung* (No. 994), in a bout with the Amsterdam *Tijd*, takes the side of the Italian Christian Democrats, particularly the Murrists, and also of the Belgian Christian Democrats; but as long as it can not give any better authority than its own *ipse dixit*, we doubt whether these parties deserve the encomiums lavished upon them.

The above (prepared by one of our regular contributors) was ready for the press when the *Civiltà Cattolica* (quad. 1283) reached us with an important article on the situation, which it does not re-

quire the positive allegation of the Berlin *Germania* (No. 279) to convince us—contains “the authentic personal opinion of the Holy Father, his hopes and apprehensions.”

This article gives a thoroughly unprejudiced account of the Bologna congress and arrives at the following conclusions :

1. The declaration adopted by 500 Christian Democrats on the eve of the Congress and debated on the floor of the convention hall, contained suggestions opposed to the directions of the Holy Father as addressed to Count Grosoli.

2. The party of the Christian Democrats (“i giovani”) did not act prudently in adhering to their program without the explicit declaration that they intended to conform it to the instructions of the Holy See.

3. Had they made such a declaration, their position would have been much clearer, and the ovations which they gave the Abbate Murri could not have been constructed as “an undisciplined protest against authority.”

4. Aside from this, the Christian Democrats remained within proper bounds at the Congress, and we may hope that they will remove all doubt with regard to their position in this respect.

5. The Holy Father still hopes great results from their activity, provided they show discipline and obey his instructions (“a condizione però che siano ben disciplinate ed ossequenti alla Sua augusta Parola.”)

6. The parliamentary form of proceeding employed for the first time at this Congress, did not prove entirely successful, principally for the reason that it permits the ecclesiastical dignitaries who were present to be made responsible for a lot of irresponsible talk. It would therefore be better to revert to the old system, which limited the debates to the committee rooms.

“In concluding,” says the *Civiltà*, “we can not refrain from earnestly deploring the very grave divisions among Catholics to which this Congress has given rise—a congress from which all, especially the Holy Father himself, had expected such great results towards unity of endeavor and harmony of action. If this division continues, God only knows what sad consequences it will have for the Catholic movement in Italy. Let everything that has caused bitterness or given more or less legitimate reason for offence,—let it all be forgotten for love of the common cause and respect for the Holy Father. Let all, the ‘old’ and the ‘young,’ now unite in the sole endeavor, to restore all things in Christ, under the guidance of our common Father, of our bishops, and of those illustrious men whom the confidence of the Holy See has appointed to be our leaders.”

How this is to be done in particular appears from the “motu

proprio" issued by Pius X. on Dec. 18th. It recapitulates the social teachings of Leo XIII. and inculcates obedience to the pontifical program, which is, of course, entirely conservative and anti-Socialistic.

Now that the opinion of the Holy Father has been made known in such unmistakable fashion, we hope that the discord which is the subject of this article will cease, and the Catholic cause in Italy will be spared the "tristissime conseguenza" which are inevitable if our brethren there do not get together and work unitedly under their supreme chief.



HOW TO PREVENT STRIKES.

II.—(*Conclusion.*)

In case of a strike the government may, at its discretion, and in case of danger of rioting or other disturbance of the peace, it shall take possession of the labor part of the business or industry involved. It shall, by public notice, inform the strikers that the case and all matters involved in the strike are in charge of the court. And when such notice is given to the strikers and the employés, all further negotiations shall be through the court; and any disturbance on the part of the strikers or other persons because of the strike, shall be treated as contempt of court. In order to protect the owners and the public against needless loss by the cessation of labor, the court may employ laborers to take the places made temporarily vacant by the strike, on such terms as shall be satisfactory to the employers and also to the court. But such employés shall hold such places only until the settlement of the strike. And when the strike is settled, if it is in favor of the strikers, all laborers shall be reinstated in the places made vacant by the strike, if they so elect. If the case is decided against the strikers, the court shall also decide as to the reinstatement of the strikers.

When because of a strike the government shall take possession of a business or industry, it shall with all diligence proceed to the investigation of the causes of the strike, and a settlement thereof. And when the strike is settled and laborers are again at work on terms satisfactory to both employers and employés, and to the government, then the government shall relinquish its control to the owners or operators. But in no case while the causes of the strike are being investigated, shall the owners or operators be allowed to employ other laborers to take the places of the strikers, except as this is done by and with the consent of the court, and on such terms as may be approved by the court.

When the decision of the court is rendered, the strikers may return to work or not, as they may elect. But if the laborers, or any of them, do not elect to return to work on the terms approved by the court, they shall not be allowed to interfere with other laborers who may wish to accept employment on such terms. Employers shall not be allowed to employ laborers on terms inconsistent with the decision of the court on points requiring a decision because of the strike. In all cases the decision of the court shall be final, subject to appeal to higher courts, on the points involved as the causes of the strike.

If in any case any business or industry shall call on the government for protection against laborers or rioters, the government shall take such control of the business as may be necessary to secure the protection sought, and it shall then proceed to a full investigation of the business to the extent necessary to an intelligent conclusion as to the causes of irritation and the best remedy to be applied. There can be no private affairs to be kept from the knowledge of the government in such cases. Every phase of every business or industry becomes a matter of public concern when the government must give to it special protection.

Strikes become a misdemeanor or a crime when they are not a necessary remedy for existing wrongs, or equally necessary in promoting the wellbeing of laborers. And if there shall be first some efficient method established for the adequate protection of labor interests and their advancement as other interests of business and industry are advanced, it will then be reasonable to treat as guilty of misdemeanor or crime those persons who continue to instigate strikes without being able to show just cause therefor. It will also be sufficient reason for more effective control by the government of business and industries which by their methods in the employment of labor cause irritations which result in strikes.

The public have a right to such an administration of just laws as shall protect them from such disturbances as strikes. That is, corporations should not be protected in the exploiting of either the public on the one hand, or laborers on the other. But all corporations are entitled to full protection in the management of their own business in their own way to the extent to which they are true to the interests of the public and of the laborers, with whom they divide the ownership of their industries and business.

On behalf of labor, which is chiefly to be considered in the preventing of strikes, it must be conceded that fair wages for laborers are such as furnish them a living for themselves and their families of a kind equal to what they are or ought to be for persons who labor. A man as a laborer is capital as really as cash is

capital. To waste the man—to injure his health or his morals, to prevent his reasonable development as a person, or to make paupers of his family, is like wasting cash capital. The right to keep a man at full value as a person is a right co-ordinate with the right to keep cash capital at its full value as cash; and it is a right which business as a business proposition can so recognize.

The recognition of these and kindred principles will prevent strikes, or at least go far toward preventing them. To recognize the fact that labor is a thing, but the laborer is a person, will clear away many difficulties. In the solving of industrial problems the owners of cash capital and the owners of labor capital must meet as equals before the law. And when this is done the mixed problems of business and philanthropy will find easy solution.

In the nature of the case, business and industries can be better conducted according to rules and methods which may be applied with a large degree of flexibility than by the more severe forms of statutes. And as industrial courts, to be effective in the preventing of strikes or ending them, must make their decisions on the basis of industrial methods and rules of business rather than on the basis of inflexible laws, a compilation of such rules and methods should be made for the use of these courts.

Let a committee of fifteen be appointed by the President, and approved by the Senate, to prepare a book for this purpose. Let this committee gather from all available sources information which shall enable them to put in concise and convenient form such rules of business and such statements of approved industrial methods, as may apply in the solving of all problems which have to do with strikes and their causes, as well as the things which they are designed to accomplish. This book should conform in style to the codifying of laws for easy reference. Principles involved in industrial and business problems should be clearly stated. Rules and methods should be put in form for easy application. And in every way the book should be so arranged as to be easily adapted to the school, the lecture platform, or the court. It should codify all statutes which may be applied in industrial cases. It should define the rights involved in industrial problems. It should show the relations of persons and things, and show how the interests of the one are to be recognized and respected by the other. This is a general outline of the scope of the book to be prepared.

Such a book, if subjected to the criticisms of judges of courts and the approval of legislatures, would have such force of authority that it might be used in industrial courts in substantially the same way that civil courts use the statutes on which they depend.

Industries in which strikes are liable to occur have to do with

money and the persons who control it, and with labor and the persons who perform it. The plan here proposed aims to treat as co-ordinates the money and the labor because they are things; and to treat as equals the capitalist and the laborer because they are persons. Things and persons are not co-ordinate; and yet any proposition from the one to the other is consistent if having to do with interests of co-ordinate value. And this plan recognizes and applies this principle. Affection has no cash value in the market, religion has none. Business can not pay for affection or religion. But it can recognize the fact that these are of value, and that the person who has cash to invest may also have affection and religion which he does not invest in the act of investing cash; and that in a similar sense the laborer who accepts an opportunity to labor does not by that act dispose of all his values as a person. Further, no person is separated from his rights and responsibilities as a person by transactions which have to do only with the *things* which he controls. The person who controls either money or labor is responsible to the public as a person, and must be considered as such, apart from the things which he controls.

In the preventing of strikes it is necessary to deal with such questions as wages and conditions of labor as business propositions. The amount of cash to be paid for a day's labor must depend on the cash value of the product of such labor. This is a business proposition. But somewhere in the transaction there is involved something that has to do with the persons who perform the labor and the persons who pay for it, as persons, and where the responsibilities of business and the responsibilities of persons begin. Hence any proposition which has to do with the industrial problem is a fair proposition to be considered by either the business or the persons who control it. And the industrial courts, in dealing with the mixed problems of business and philanthropy, must have sufficient authority to prevent the lapsing of responsibility in any transition from things to persons, or *vice versa*. Courts having authority to deal with industrial problems as mixed problems of business and philanthropy, and authority to pass to either side of the dividing line in their investigations and their decisions, can prevent strikes, or end them, if they have also the power to enforce their authority. And the substance of this plan is that each state, and also the federal government, shall establish such courts with such authority and power.

THE EGYPTIAN SUN-GOD IN MODERN AMERICAN FREEMASONRY.

Another remark, and we shall leave the present quotation. "On" was the name of a deity. This our author himself in his *Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry*, pp. 546-547, abundantly demonstrates.

"On," he says, "is a significant word in Royal Arch Masonry, and has generally been explained as being the name by which Jehovah was worshiped among the Egyptians. As this has been recently denied and the word asserted to be only the name of a city in Egypt, it is proper that some enquiry should be made into the authorities on the subject. The first mention of On in the Bible is in the history of Joseph, to whom Pharaoh gave 'to wife Asenath, the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On.' The city of On was in Lower Egypt, between the Nile and the Red Sea, and 'adorned,' says Philippon, 'by a gorgeous temple of the sun, in which a numerous priesthood officiated.' The investigations of modern Egyptologists have shown that this is an error. On was the name of a city where the Sun-god was worshiped, but On was not the name of that god." He then goes on to prove by the authority of Champollion, "Bunsen, Lepsius, Gliddon, and all recent authorities," that the Egyptian name of the Sun-god was Ra. This demonstration concluded, he continues :

"But although On was really the name of a city, the founders of the Royal Arch had, with the lights then before them, assumed that it was the name of a god, and had so incorporated it with their system. With better light than theirs, we can no longer accept their definition; yet the word may still be retained as a symbol of the Egyptian god. I know not who has power to reject it; and if scholars preserve, outside of the symbolism, the true interpretation, no harm will be done. It is not the only significant word in Masonry whose old and received meaning has been shown to be incorrect, and sometimes even absurd. And yet the word is retained as the expression of an old idea."

The ease with which an elaborate system can be constructed when we are at liberty to assume facts, is patent to all. Nor is On, the sun-god of the Egyptians, the only assumption of the builders of Masonry. The whole fabric is one of assumption, and hence of wonderful elasticity, since, even when, as in the present case, the fact is proved to be false, it can still be retained in the system, because "if scholars preserve the true interpretation," it will do no harm!! Are all Masons scholars? Is the true interpretation of Masonic symbols imparted to all Masons in every degree? Error is necessarily propagated by such a method; but

since error has, in Masonry, changed its nature, and is no longer the antithesis, the opponent of truth, but its modification, its approximation, it can certainly do no harm!!!

"The old Masons," therefore says our author, "misled by the authority of St. Cyril and by the translation of the name of the city into 'City of the Sun,' by the Hebrews and the Greeks, very naturally supposed that On was the Egyptian sun-god, their supreme deity, as the sun always was, wherever he was worshiped. Hence they appropriated that name as a sacred word explanatory of the Jewish tetragrammaton."

In other words, Jehovah was but another name for the sun-god; a symbol accepted by the uninitiated as the expression of Him whom Jew and Christian adore, but received by the initiated, who knew the "true interpretation," as an expression of the fire-god, the vivifier and purifier and pervader of nature!

Masonry, the fosterling of paganism, is not much inclined to follow the guidance of the Fathers of the Church. How sad, then, that, in the present case, where the older Masons followed St. Cyril, they fell into error! Sad, sad indeed was their lot, but why so foolish as to trust themselves to the guidance of a Father? Is our author joking? Does he really believe what he says, that the old Masons were deceived by following St. Cyril? We have another explanation to offer and we think it is more solid. The term has reference to the Greek and Catholic translation of the word Jehovah, *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, I am the On or Being, i. e., the self-existing Being. If we can invent an Egyptian sun-god named On, how nicely will the Greek participle *ὢν*, on account of similarity of pronunciation, fit into the system which we have been studying; a system which makes Jehovah, Bel, and On, "varieties" of the ineffable word. On is the sun-god; Bel or Baal is the fire-god, a modification of the sun-god; Jehovah in the Greek is On, and hence by a substitution of the Egyptian for the Greek meaning, or by a simpler process, by considering Masonically the two as identical, we shall have the sentence *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, "I am who am," transformed into "I am On," "I am the sun-god." How simple Masonry makes everything when it is free to manufacture its facts! But On is not the name of the sun-god, and the similarity of sound can no longer be made the basis of a fallacious argument; the ritual will, however, retain the error, since we are told that it will do no harm to Masonry, provided that the learned keep in view the true interpretation of the symbol!

LITERARY NOTES.

—The *Carmelite Review* has removed from Canada to Chicago and now appears as the *New Carmelite Review* under the editorship of Rev. Eneas B. Goodwin. It is much improved in style and make-up and evidently aims at becoming a high-class Catholic family magazine. We wish it success.

—‘St. John Baptist de la Salle’ is a brochure sent out by the Christian Brothers’ Novitiate near Baltimore, Md., with a view to foster vocations among our boys and young men for their admirable Institute. It contains an enthusiastic sketch of the holy founder’s life, and can be had for the asking from Brother Austin, Visitor, Ammendale, Md.

—No. 5 of the *Educational Briefs* contains ‘The Training of the Teacher’ by Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C., reprinted from the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* of Oct., 1903. The author writes chiefly from the standpoint of the parochial school, and his main contention is that we need Catholic normal schools or colleges for the training of teachers.

—Our friend Rev. C. J. Kluser, of Morganton, W. Va., is contributing to the *Freeman’s Journal* a series of instructive papers on Ulrich Zwingli, the pretended Swiss patriot and reformer. He writes principally to refute Zwingli’s latest American biographers, Prof. Jackson and Dr. Simpson. Fr. Kluser’s refutation would be still more valuable if he would give his sources for such statements as this, that Zwingli was a grossly immoral man. Janssen furnishes proofs galore on this and other important points, but how few American readers have access to Janssen?

—J. J. Fahie has published a new life of Galileo: ‘Galileo, His Life and Work’ (London: John Murray). He says in the introduction that, thanks mainly to Professor Favaro, the learned and laborious director of the “National Edition” of the works of Galileo, he is enabled to present “much new matter,” and, what is more important, to avoid “most, if not all, of the numerous errors and fables which previous biographers have little by little woven into the life of Galileo.” The *Tablet* (Dec. 5th, 1903) declares that Mr. Fahie has accomplished his task “in a fairly adequate manner,” and that, despite his partisanship for the great Tuscan, “his presentation of the facts of the case is truthful.”

—We recommend to our readers an annual subscription to *Vaccination*, a monthly journal, published by Mr. Frank D. Blue,

of 1320 N. Twelfth Street, Terre Haute, Ind., for the Anti-Vaccination Society of America, which staunchly advocates a rational battling with the dreaded scourge of smallpox, instead of poisoning the blood of children and adults alike with the terrible vaccine virus. There is no better way of enlightening the people in any locality on the true nature of vaccination and the means of preventing a panic in case of an outbreak of smallpox, than by circulating this little journal, which costs but fifty cents a year, together with a few of the popular pamphlets which its editor has for sale.

—‘Hypnotism, its History, Practice and Theory’ by J. Milne Bramwell (Philadelphia : Lippincott & Co.) contains a very interesting chapter on the history of hypnotism. Nearly a hundred years ago, in 1814, the Abbé Faria suggested that the phenomena of hypnotism were subjective in origin, that is, were really due to conditions within the patient himself, rather than to any influence or force that passed from the operator to the patient. This attracted very little notice at the time, but represents at the present moment the basis of the modern explanation of hypnotism. Dr. Bramwell also discusses the various theories of hypnotism, and its value in medicine and surgery. As for its dangers, he says that after much experience he has never seen them ; which, of course, does not prove that they do not exist. Other authorities, especially Catholic authorities, as our readers know, strongly assert and prove the reality of these dangers.

—Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin has begun the twenty-first volume of his *American Catholic Historical Researches* [issued quarterly at 2009 N. 12th St., Philadelphia ; subscription \$1 a year]. The magazine was founded by our esteemed friend Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL. D., in July, 1884 ; Mr. Griffin has conducted it since January, 1887. Its twenty volumes contain a vast amount of original documentary information on the history of the Catholic Church and of Catholics in this country. The *Researches*, in the interest of Catholic history, ought to be issued monthly, to enable Mr. Griffin to publish all the valuable historical material which he has collected ; but unfortunately, to use his own words (January No., p. 26) “there is not interest enough in the millions we boast of to justify it nor enough public-spirited men to adopt measures to get collected and published the mass of Catholic American historical data to be had.” We hope Mr. Griffin will find some support at least among our readers. It is the duty of Catholics the country over to encourage Mr. Griffin in his laudable work.

MINOR TOPICS.

The Fee Simple Tenure of Church Property in Michigan.—We are in receipt of a card from Rev. Father L. Vandriss, of the Diocese of Detroit, requesting us to publish an article on the tenure of church property in the United States which he lately contributed to *Le Patriote*, of Brussels (No. 337).

Father Vandriss makes some remarks by Bishop Maes of Covington at the Eucharistic Congress of Namur the text of a statement of the dangers to which Catholic church property is exposed in Michigan, because the bishops of Grand Rapids and Detroit hold it in fee simple, instead of incorporating under the law.

We beg to observe that this question has been treated in *THE REVIEW* with great fullness and circumstance by an eminent canonist as far back as 1899 (see vol. vi, pp. 146, 161, 188, 222, 236, 260, 276; also vol. vii, p. 20.) We showed there that the fee simple tenure of church property in Michigan was not only against the discipline of the Church, but very dangerous to her best interests; that it made the property subject to taxation; that it exposed a diocese to the danger of losing all its property in case a bishop became demented or a schismatic; that it gave rise to legal quibbling (see the contradictory testimony of two bishops before civil courts quoted in *THE REVIEW*, vol. vi, p. 161); we pointed to the Purcell case in Cincinnati as an example of what the abuse can lead to; we showed how the bishops of Wisconsin did away with the fee simple system for these same reasons; we reported the decision in *re* Foley vs. Kleibusch at some length (vol. vii, p. 20) and said in concluding our comment on the same:

"The decision is simply one *ad hominem*, and while it decides the case at bar, it goes no further. The question of the tenure of Catholic church property in Michigan is farther from a decision than it was before this case was started. Nothing whatever is determined, Catholic church property is in the same position as before,—*a position which we have time and again shown to be extremely dangerous.* The only safe method is for the bishops of Michigan, in fact for those of every State in the Union, to incorporate, as did the bishops of Wisconsin some short while ago to their everlasting credit."

We are sorry to see from Father Vandriss' article in *Le Patriote* that church property in Michigan continues to be exposed to the dangers of fee simple tenure. Father Vandriss informs us privately that he published his article with the silent approval of the Prefect of the Propaganda.*) Yet, can the situation be remedied by newspaper articles? If *THE REVIEW* could not remedy it in 1899, will the *Patriote*, appearing in far-off Belgium, be more successful in 1904.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore allows a fee simple tenure of church property only when none other is possible and as a last resort (Dec. 267). Now, as we showed in this journal as long ago as July 27th, 1899, "the Michigan legislature in 1897 passed a most liberal law for incorporating religious societies. Under it Catholic churches may be incorporated and their prop-

erty held as determined in by-laws made by the corporations themselves. Separate diocesan and parish corporations, as required by Canon Law, are possible, and every advantage is gained thereby and no trouble or inconvenience incurred. The bishop and four or more officials, preferably the diocesan consultors, may become incorporated for the holding of diocesan property as such; the bishop, the vicar-general, the pastor, and two laymen, if advisable, may become a parish corporation, a separate corporation being advisable for each parish in accordance with Canon Law."

"What," we queried in conclusion of the article quoted," what can be the reason for delaying incorporation?"

What, we repeat to-day, after four years more have elapsed, what can be the reasons for refusing to go through a legal formality which would quiet the apprehensions of the clergy and laity and forever do away with the dangers of fee simple tenure?

Why Catholic Lay Editors Can Be More Outspoken Than Priests.—Our friend Dr. Condé B. Pallen contributed to the recent "Catholic controversy" in the New York *Sun*, now fortunately ended, an interesting letter, which that journal printed at the request of Archbishop Farley. We extract a few passages of particular interest:

"As the quondam editor of a Catholic journal for a decade of years, I found no ecclesiastical trammels put upon my utterances, and in many matters I criticised freely and vigorously. During this period I had an intimate acquaintance with the Catholic press, and I found it anything but muzzled. Indeed I often wondered at the elastic quality of episcopal toleration. In some instances I have witnessed a license of speech that in the premises would have fully justified rebuke. There have been, it is true, occasions when ecclesiastical authority has been exercised without due warrant, but these have been rare exceptions. Bishops are human, and in the application of disciplinary measures may have, and no doubt have made mistakes. But this by no means gives a premise for the sweeping conclusion that speech is tyrannically gyved within the Catholic body. On the whole, my observation and experience have shown me that outside of matters of faith and morals and their corollaries [for within these limits there is no room for mere opinion], there is within the Catholic Church an amplitude of freedom which would more than satisfy an intellect of the widest range. I may note, by the way, that the less the intellectual power, the more notable the disposition to chafe at hypothetical limits.

"When the question of the right of a priest to utter his views as he pleases in public is touched upon, there are other considerations to be taken into account. A priest, I take it, is under an especial discipline by his very calling, just as an army officer is. Outside of the question of *noblesse oblige*, which always gravely weighs with a man of honor, the obligation of public reticence upon the part of army officers in the way of criticism of the acts of their superiors is, I believe, a universal principle of military codes.

*] We fear he overestimates the silence of Cardinal Gotti.

The subaltern who would criticise his superiors in the public prints would, I imagine, find short shift. Nor could it be said, in view of the serious exigencies of discipline, that the infliction of due penalties in such an instance would be despotic suppression of free speech. I notice among army officers even in private a fine reticence in regard to the policies and measures of their superiors. It may be said that the position of a Catholic priest is perfectly analogous. He is a subaltern in a great army, and has taken special vows and assumed special obligations which bind him in a way in which a layman is not bound. When he rushes into public print with his grievances and appeals to the *profanum vulgus*, he violates the essential spirit of his calling. When it is known that there is an ample canonical remedy in the proper way of procedure, his clamorous recourse, especially under an anonym, to the public ear, comes nothing short of disloyalty and can not fail to be a scandal to the laity."

These considerations will also explain the forced resignation of Rev. Cornelius Clifford, of the Providence *Visitor*, for having editorially attacked the Archdiocese of Boston as a "dismal valley of dry bones." Archbishop Williams, we learn from the Boston *Republic* [Oct. 31st, 1903] "took exception to the phrase used and to the whole tone of the article," which was irreverent and severely critical, and Father Clifford was forced to resign. He is succeeded by a layman, Prof. Rivier of Rochester.

A Monumental Mistake.—Rome has lately been exercised by a monument. The story of it is this. Some enterprising Liberal a few years ago came upon a volume entitled 'The Rights of Man,' written by one Nicholas Spedalieri, a Sicilian priest who flourished in the XVIII. century. The discoverer was in too great a hurry to read 'The Rights of Man'—but after all what was the use, for did not the title speak for itself? But he lost no time in getting together a committee for organizing some kind of a monument to the great Spedalieri. He was amazingly successful. Poets like Carducci and Rapisardi, philosophers and statesmen like Bovio, Grispi, Crimaldi, Colajanni, Picardi—in short all the *fin fleur* of Italian liberalism and anti-clericalism rushed to inscribe their illustrious names on the Spedalieri committee; Prince Ruspoli, Mayor of Rome, was an enthusiastic supporter of the idea of erecting a monument to the revolutionary abbate in the Eternal City; King Humbert contributed to the funds, and finally the government itself, after an eloquent speech on Spedalieri by Minister Broglio, voted four thousand francs for the monument. Then the monument was put up in the little piazza flanking the church of Sant' Andrea della Valle, and wrapped in a white sheet until the day of its unveiling. The white sheet remained on for eight months until it became a very black sheet indeed, and when it was torn off in the dead of the night by platoon of Roman police especially delegated by the Questor for the purpose, indignation meetings were held in various parts of the city to protest against the monument. Why? Well, it appears that the famous 'Rights of Man' is after all a highly clerical, reactionary, and generally stupid production. The poets and philosophers and politicians had all neglected the little preliminary to their enthusiasm of

reading the work they destined for immortality. The majority are at present in favor of taking down the unfortunate Spedalieri from his pedestal, on which the brief but eloquent inscription "To Nicholas Spedalieri—New Italy" stands out in letters of bronze; but nothing of the kind will be done, and the future historian will be greatly puzzled to find an explanation of this unique Roman monument.

A Plea for Simplicity in Church Building is made by one who is considered an authority on the subject, Mr. J. T. Comes, Pittsburg, in the January *Messenger*. He attributes our failures in church-building mainly "to shams, to superficiality, to perfunctoriness." "A cathedral effect," he says, "is often sought with a chapel income," and thereby, we honestly believe, strikes at one root of the evil. "If a uniformly organic and integrally constructed Gothic building is unavailable, on account of the cost, why try to imitate it with an elaborate system of shams and veneers?"

Of course, there is "danger of our church architecture becoming entirely secularized, and treated in the same manner as an office building or any other commercial structure." And Mr. Comes does well in insisting, with the greatest possible emphasis, that our Catholic churches "be built in purity and in truth," that they be not concert halls, but becoming temples of the Most High. "An humble and even crudely constructed church, rightly conceived and executed, is infinitely better than a gorgeously bedaubed and bedizened building full of meaningless ornaments which neither instruct nor decorate."

We trust Mr. Comes' paper will contribute to the development of American Catholic Church architecture on logical and conservative lines."

—By decree of the S. Congregation of the Index, dated Dec. 4th, 1903, the following works have been condemned: 'La Question Biblique' and 'Mes Difficultés avec mon Évêque,' by the Abbé Albert Houtin; 'La Religion d'Israël,' 'L'Évangile et l'Église,' 'Études Évangéliques,' 'Autour d'un Petit Livre,' and 'Le Quatrième Évangile,' by the Abbé Alfred Loisy. This decision puts an end to the hot controversy that had been kindled in France by the literary activity of these two turbulent ecclesiastics and has found an echo in this country in the *Catholic World Magazine*. The condemnation derives particular solemnity from the fact that, according to a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Paris by the Cardinal Secretary of State, under date of Dec. 19th, the Holy Father, "deeply grieved and touched by the destructive consequences which such books entail," inasmuch as they spread "exceedingly grave errors," had submitted the works of Loisy to the Congregation of the Universal Inquisition, by which they have been formally and solemnly condemned.

—We are informed by His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate, in a letter dated January 14th, that the rumor concerning the appointment of a primate in this country and the consequent withdrawal of the Apostolic Delegation, is positively without foundation.

